Dear Walter, 11/4/73

The weather here has suddenly turned seasonal. I have just come in from a fair siege of outside work on a sunny day that seems colder than it is because of the abrupt change, feeling good because of the exertion the beauty of the day and the opportunity to detach my mind from the immediate, almost always the current writing but when it is not, not usually an agreeable matter.

I have completed another part that will be typed as a chapter but with breaks indicated and have begun the last of these extraordinarily long pieces. Lil has one awaiting her reading and then typing when she completes the one she is now typing. Her typing is not mine so I'll have no qualm about sending it when she finishes it.

There are questions and doubts, of course, and I hope that in time you will be able to find time to give me your opinion. I am aware that length is an overwhelming problem. One of my concerns is whether I have put it together in a way that will permit the easiest and fastest cutting, where I feel a judgement other than mine should determine what is needed and what is not.

I hope that reading the last part gives you a better idea of where I am trying to go. I am trying to make the whole monstrous thing comprehensible and to tell what I think is necessry for both comprehension and credibility. On such horrendous subjects, I have learned, there is a special credibility standard coming from an intense reluctance that for most amounts to a refusal to believe. Were it not for considerable experience I would not feel this way. Thus I say more than on most subjects would be required and seek to illuminate.

In order to save space -imagine the arrogance of the man!- I am ignoring much of what made headlines and paying scant attention to other parts of the story as it developed because it is not my purpose to retell what has appeared in the papers, heavily as I draw upon that. Excess attention to some of the details would only make for obscurity. All that Segretti did, for example. Enough is relevant to other parts of the treatment to tell the reader while telling him something else. (This is too enormous to compartmentalize except as a recounting of the papers.Or I feel that way.)

What led me to thinking along these lines is an incident during a phone conversation several days ago. It was with Barry Sussman, a metro editor of the Wash. Post and the first editor on this story. It has now been recaptured by the national desk. The reporting suffers for it.

There came a time when Barry decided he had to write a book. He got a contract, took time off and wrote it. Remember, he is the editor under whom the two reporters who got all the attention, the prizes and the fat contract worked. First of all this conforts me because it confirms my judgement that these two would be incapable of saying what has to be said and that their book will be a respectable and useful rehash of what they have already reported. There is, of course, a place for this kind of book, it does little social good. Well, when Barry finished it, he had to write a long addition to it. He has that done and it needs more. He was to make the decision whether to do what he now feels is necessary this weekend. At one point he said something that made me feel good. "This needs context, like you give in your work." I have never discussed my work with him and had no inkling he was even familiar with it. He added something that may interest you and again pleased me, the opinion that a book with context is required so the people can put pressure on Congress, which needs it. (This belief may be the reason he is not now in charge of the story at the Post!)

He has had a lot of rewriting to do. I dont know how much more he has. I think I will have no revisions attributable to events or to unforseen developments. You may remember that in May I told you I think Nixon will fight in his unique way to the end and may well hold on. The alternatives then not talked about were resignation, impeachment and an overt dictatorship. I have not changed my belief, nothing has happened that I think requires it, the organization of the work makes it possible to do that which is least likely to be influenced by events first, and I think when I am finished I will have been in tune with what by then has eventuated. Also, I will not have a work that has been invalidated by events or even overtaken by them. Whatever happens, if

I succeed inx what I intend, what I have written will be relevant and will make the whole thing not yet at its end comprehensible.

If you have not yet noted it, I think you will also find this a social commentary. It will, I do hope, make comprehensible to those who lack the understanding how each of the basic institutions of society failed in great crisis, hopefully also why. Some understanding of this kind is essential for any kind of decent society to follow that which is now upon us. (And I am not a Pollyana about that!) Unless the people understand, nothing decent is possible.

So many subplots! And all to be handled simultaneously.

Perhaps it is too soon for you to know, but one of my worries is have I gone too far in providing the reader what the average one will need for comprehension of what boggles the mind, what is like nothing ever in American experience? The reader whose life revolves around the tube and creature comforts in a culture of waste. By the time you can tell me it will be academic, for I will have completed the parts to which this worry is applicable. After the monster I've begun, I get to what I think may be more difficult but I look forward to it because it is a challenge and because I think I will enjoy it more. I believe that little by little I am bringing in more that is unknown to as well informed a man as you. What will follow is a mixture of the essence of the Senate's disclosures with what they suppressed (insofar as I have been able to latch onto it) combined with what was not even investigated at all. It is here that I think there will be excitement, if that is the word. But if it is to have meaning, and not only for the average man if more for him, all that I have done and now doing is, I think, in some form required. Who could begin to believe that the amiable old man whose eyebrows wobbly such attractive punctuation, who transmits indignation and sincerity on nationwise TV so effectively, in secret does what amounts to suborning perjury and has, in fact, protected the evil-doers from their most sinister evil-doing? If you have watched TV, can you believe that the intelligence community has been sheltered? And that Nixon has been? Yes, for all that is known, Nixon.

Well, I'm rambling and forgetting other questions I had.

May I ask if, after the Cox affair, you can now better understand some of my purposes in going into the intial obstruction of justice by the prosecutors? I don't think that has been addressed anywhere and I did it months ago. I will also have the other side of Cox, made into a hero by Nixon's urgencies. Before this massacre I had completed the chapter Lil is typing and I will be enclosing. I will not therefore comment on it, but I am not without pride in having seen as much as clearly as soon. Those who read what you have and I will be enclosing will require no explanations - I hope - of why Nixon fired Cox. It will, I also hope, be immaterial whether the missing tapes are incriminating. (I have been trying to show the Post, which is unwilling, how to get a definitive answer. It is simple. But they are really gutless, unless they are given no choice.) I never had any doubt that they have to be.

What is also incredible, I suspect, is that the new special prosecutor is in my files. The papers were terrified, so I got a radio reporter friend to break the story. His ultra-conservative owners are delighted, but the liberals won't touch it. Jaworski has compromising CIA connections and he is one of the more proficient whitewashers, with a clear record of having been conned by the White House already. I'll be sending the documents from my files on this to Sussman with a friend who is visiting me tomorrow. In reaction to this story, if I can guage it without a paper (the Post is on strike) is in Jaworski's promise to resign all his directorships. He was on a CIA conduit foundation. Two reporters who wrote a book that includes this "forgot" it. My friend phoned both.

I have had less influence on events than I might have hoped for, but I have not been without influence, remote as I am from Washington. In fact, an agressive publisher might get good use out of what I tried to give away to the press. It will be included and I regard what has not come out as sensational even after all that has come out. One of these things that nobody would touch came out by accident, his light-fingers with tax money. There came a time, long before it was out, when I tried to get information

from the White House on this. My knowledge was much, much earlier. Those who would not do anything read like a press bluebook.

Even with a would-be assassin.

With the chapter you have, rather the last one, I have gotten into what I regard as the tough stuff, both in Watergatecontent and in what I anticipate will not be received any better than criticism of Warren. Ons that if you can find the time I would appreciate any opinions you may have but most of all on does it make a case and if so clearly enough; and do you believe that it will be credited. Of course there will be more like it because there is more of the same character relating to suppressions.

On other problems, do you believe the recent disclosures will more likely, if either, result is greater or lesser publisher receptiveness to a tough book?

Do you believe the exposures of Nixon aside from what is directly Watergate can make this more commercial with the new low in popularity and trust he has now established? What I am on now is more of this but different than any of the other and what has not been said. Nixon as a totalitarian.

... In my life of contention I am now involved with the second of the courts with which Nixon is. They are neither as brave or as honest as the papers would lead the uninformed to believe. Both are literally terrified and have been copping out to the extent possible.But I won't do more than report the fact and that I am about to do the unprecedented, whether or not it succeeds, before going to the Supreme Court. Now that it is too late, all the yellow-livered liberals are talking about joining. I think that unless the going gets too tough, there will be prestigeous amicus curiae with me then. Three have already indicated a willingness. I started this particular effort in 1966, when the ACLU refused to help.

I guess this is another way of saying that in addition to the inherent difficulty of what I have undertaken, in addition to the serious problems added by our situation, I am simultaneously an activist, which takes time and brings its own set of problems. The tradition is good but the field is empty. Summer soldiers only.

I did not have time for any real work before supper so while these questions were on my mind I wanted to write to be able to mail when Lil has finished, perhaps even tonight.

Also, a favor. As you go over the trade press, would you please keep for me all references to Hunt and his books and to Tad Szulc and the book he has done on Hunt for Viking? I suspect he has special connections and that his book, for which there is also a very legitimate market, may well serve non-commercial purposes. The Hunt story has not been told. I read the galleys of his Give Us This Day (Szulc doesn't know but they are the ones he annotated!) and it discloses what is of value only where he did not intend it. It is really a crappy job, given his role as chief political officer of the Bay of Pigs. His intention was self- and political justification. Except to the Birchers he failed in both. Szulc knew him when. I'll be interested in seeing what he says of what he knew and how. He did not mention him in his own Bay of Pigs book, a fascinating oversight. Oversight? He knew Hunt beginning in 1949.

Did you ever see so many concentric wheels?

Best,